



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/065,802	11/20/2002	Martin Trapp	YOR920020159US1	6567

877 7590 12/14/2004

IBM CORPORATION, T.J. WATSON RESEARCH CENTER
P.O. BOX 218
YORKTOWN HEIGHTS, NY 10598

EXAMINER

BAUM, RONALD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2136

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2004

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/065,802

Applicant(s)

TRAPP ET AL.

Examiner

Ronald Baum

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 6 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/23/2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-68 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-68 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4,10.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2136

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action replaces the prior first (non final) office action, mailed 11/23/2004.
2. Claims 1-68 are pending for examination.
3. Claims 1-68 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

The term "match" in claims 42,43,50,51,55,56,59,60,65,68 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "match" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree or context of said "match" determining or testing for, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Correction is required..

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schneier et al, U.S. Patent 6,099,408.

Art Unit: 2136

5. As per claim 1; "A computer-based method for a multiparty electronic service [i.e., Abstract, whereas the playing of electronic games over a network by one or more players corresponds to the 'multiparty electronic service'], the method comprising steps of negotiating a machine interpretable service specification between all parties, which would cooperate with a particular application running on a host system [i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'service specification between all parties' as to the setup prior to playing online games/establishing associated random number information associated with said playing of games.]; defining said service specification to: identify cooperating parties [i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'identify cooperating parties'. Also, multiple players/game would clearly have to be identified such that the server database referencing is a function of the client identity as an index into the said database.]; identify a requestor and format of a service request, said request is adapted to contain information about an individual [i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'requestor and format of a service request' insofar as the communications protocols of the game initiator at least is concerned (i.e., figure 4 and associated description).]; conduct conditional processing steps required for said service request, said conditional processing steps is adapted to use stored data about said individual [i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of players

Art Unit: 2136

selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'conditional processing steps is adapted to use stored data about said individual'.]; and provide conditional notifications, said notifications is adapted to include additional information about the individual described in the request [i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'additional information about the individual described in the request' insofar as the requestor clearly must have submitted user information in the game registration process as any of the other player are similarly required to do so.]; providing a secure computation environment in said host system [i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the cryptographic processors, on a per player user client terminal and server side host, clearly teaches of 'secure computation environment'.]; uploading said service specification into said secure computation environment [i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'uploading said service specification' insofar as the clients and servers clearly have the same rules and all associated information required to play.]; enforcing said service specification with regards to all cooperating parties [i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'enforcing said service specification with regards to all cooperating parties' insofar as the clients and servers clearly have the same rules and all associated information required to play, and as such use said information during the actual game playing.]; receiving a service request from said requestor

Art Unit: 2136

[i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the subsequent to the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'receiving a service request from said requestor' insofar as the clients and servers clearly have the same rules and all associated information required to play, and as such use said information during the actual game playing.]; providing a secure co-processor in said secure computation environment for processing said service request, where said secure processing includes: determining the service specification that governs said service request; validating the actual requestor and the content of the service request against an expected requestor and expected contents as defined in the service specification; and executing the conditional processing and the notifications as defined in the service specification [i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the cryptographic processors, on a per player user client terminal and server side host, clearly teaches of 'secure computation environment' insofar as the authentication and actual game playing cryptographic functions serviced via the cryptographic processor secure computing environment.].”;

Further, as per claim 17; “Apparatus [This claim is the system claim for the method claim 1 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 1 rejection] for a multiparty electronic service, the apparatus comprising: at least one host computer adapted to have at least one secure co-processor operating in a secure computation environment, said at least one host computer operative to: negotiate a machine interpretable service specification between all parties, which would cooperate with a particular application running on said host computer; upload said service specification into said secure computation environment; enforce said service specification with regards to all cooperating parties; receive a service request from a requestor;

Art Unit: 2136

execute secure processing of said service request; and provide notifications as defined in the service specification.”;

Further, as per claim 35; “A program storage device readable by a machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform methods steps [This claim is the embodied software claim for the method claim 17 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 17 rejection] for managing a matching identification service, the method comprising the steps of: negotiating a machine interpretable service specification between all parties, which would cooperate with a particular application running on a host system; defining said service specification to: identify cooperating parties; identify a requestor and format of a service request, said request is adapted to contain information about an individual; conduct conditional processing steps required for said service request, said conditional processing steps is adapted to use stored data about said individual; and provide conditional notifications, said notifications is adapted to include additional information about the individual described in the request; providing a secure computation environment in said host system; uploading said service specification into said secure computation environment; enforcing said service specification with regards to all cooperating parties; receiving a service request from said requestor; providing a secure co-processor in said secure computation environment for processing said service request, where said secure processing includes: determining the service specification that governs said service request; validating the actual requestor and the content of the service request against an expected requestor and expected contents as defined in the service specification; and executing the conditional processing and the notifications as defined in the service specification.”.

Art Unit: 2136

Further, as per claim 34; "An article of manufacture [This claim is the embodied software claim for the method claim 1 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 1 rejection] for use in a multiparty electronic service, comprising a machine readable medium tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by a machine for implementing a method, the method comprising steps of: negotiating a machine interpretable service specification between all parties, which would cooperate with a particular application running on a host system; defining said service specification to: identify cooperating parties; identify a requestor and format of a service request, said request is adapted to contain information about an individual; conduct conditional processing steps required for said service request, said conditional processing steps is adapted to use stored data about said individual; and provide conditional notifications, said notifications is adapted to include additional information about the individual described in the request; providing a secure computation environment in said host system; uploading said service specification into said secure computation environment; enforcing said service specification with regards to all cooperating parties-,receiving a service request from said requestor; providing a secure co-processor in said secure computation environment for processing said service request, where said secure processing includes: determining the service specification that governs said service request; validating the actual requestor and the content of the service request against an expected requestor and expected contents as defined in the service specification; and executing the conditional processing and the notifications as defined in the service specification."

Art Unit: 2136

6. Claim 2 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 1 further comprising the step of allowing at least one party of said cooperating parties to cancel said service specification wherein all future service requests that rely on said cancelled service specification will be rejected.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches, insofar as if any player decides he doesn’t want to continue, that criteria, at the least, is inherent in the number of wagers type of specification for playing a given game round setup, as broadly interpreted by the examiner would clearly encompass ‘one party of said cooperating parties to cancel said service specification wherein all future service requests that rely on said cancelled service specification will be rejected’).

7. Claim 3 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 2 wherein said steps of negotiating a machine interpretable service specification, uploading, enforcing, receiving a service request, and canceling said service specification comprises the step of conducting said previous steps multiple times.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches, insofar as if any player decides he doesn’t want to continue, that criteria, at the least, is inherent in the number of wagers type of specification for playing a given game round setup, as broadly

Art Unit: 2136

interpreted by the examiner would clearly encompass 'previous steps multiple times' such that multiple rounds of play are clearly playable.);

Further, as per claim 22 *additionally reciting* the limitation that; "The apparatus of claim 17 wherein said at least one host computer operative to negotiate said machine interpretable service specification, upload said service specification, enforce said service specification, and receive a service request, is further operative to conduct said negotiating, uploading, enforcing and receiving functions multiple times.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches, insofar as if any player decides he doesn't want to continue, that criteria, at the least, is inherent in the number of wagers type of specification for playing a given game round setup, as broadly interpreted by the examiner would clearly encompass 'previous steps multiple times' such that multiple rounds of play are clearly playable.).

8. Claim 4 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The method of claim 1 further comprising the steps of: negotiating multiple machine interpretable service specifications; defining said multiple service specifications; uploading said multiple service specifications into said secure computation environment; and enforcing said multiple service specifications with regards to all cooperating parties.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple

Art Unit: 2136

player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches, insofar as if any player decides he wants to continue playing, that criteria, at the least, is inherent in the number of wagers type of specification for playing a given game in a *multi round* setup, as broadly interpreted by the examiner would clearly encompass 'multiple service specifications with regards to all cooperating parties'.);

Further, as per claim 28 ***additionally reciting*** the limitation that; "The apparatus of claim 17 wherein said at least one host computer operative to negotiate a machine interpretable service specification between all parties is further operative to: negotiate multiple machine interpretable service specifications; define said multiple service specifications; upload said multiple service specifications into said secure computation environment; and enforce said multiple service specifications with regards to all cooperating parties.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches, insofar as if any player decides he wants to continue playing, that criteria, at the least, is inherent in the number of wagers type of specification for playing a given game in a *multi round* setup, as broadly interpreted by the examiner would clearly encompass 'multiple service specifications with regards to all cooperating parties'.).

9. Claim 5 ***additionally recites*** the limitation that; "The method of claim 4 wherein said secure processing steps further comprises the step of having at least one of said secure processing steps being executed unconditionally.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed

Art Unit: 2136

towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col. 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches, insofar as if any player decides he wants to play per se, that criteria, at the least, is inherent in the fact that the secure processing via the cryptographic processor(s) used in the authentication or for as game appropriate, random number generation services, as broadly interpreted by the examiner would clearly encompass 'secure processing steps being executed unconditionally').

10. Claim 6 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The method of claim 1 wherein said secure processing steps further comprises the step of having at least one of said secure processing steps use data provided in said service request and found in said host system to derive further information about said individual described in said service request." The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col. 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches, insofar as if any player decides he wants to play per se, that criteria, at the least, is inherent in the fact that the secure processing via the cryptographic processor(s) used in the authentication or for as game appropriate, random number generation services, as broadly interpreted by the examiner would clearly encompass 'at least one of said secure processing steps use data provided in said service request and found in said host system to derive further information about said individual described in said service request' insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate

Art Unit: 2136

intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process.);

Further, as per claim 23 *additionally reciting* the limitation that, "The apparatus of claim 17 wherein said at least one host computer is further operative to use data provided in said service request and found in said host computer to derive further information about an individual described in said service request.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches, insofar as if any player decides he wants to play per se, that criteria, at the least, is inherent in the fact that the secure processing via the cryptographic processor(s) used in the authentication or for as game appropriate, random number generation services, as broadly interpreted by the examiner would clearly encompass 'at least one of said secure processing steps use data provided in said service request and found in said host system to derive further information about said individual described in said service request' insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process.).

11. Claim 7 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The method of claim 6 wherein said at least one of said secure processing steps further comprises the step of computing a correlation between biometric data provided in said service request and biometric data looked up in said host

Art Unit: 2136

system.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 6, lines 39-65, col. 15, lines 66-col. 16, line 64, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the appropriate use of biometrics, as broadly interpreted by the examiner, and would thus clearly encompass ‘correlation between biometric data provided in said service request and biometric data looked up in said host system’.);

Further, as per claim 24 *additionally reciting* the limitation that, “The apparatus of claim 23 wherein said at least one host computer is further operative to compute a correlation between biometric data provided in said service request and biometric data looked up in said host computer.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 6, lines 39-65, col. 15, lines 66-col. 16, line 64, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the appropriate use of biometrics, as broadly interpreted by the examiner, and would thus clearly encompass ‘correlation between biometric data provided in said service request and biometric data looked up in said host system’.);

Further, as per claim 25 *additionally reciting* the limitation that, “The apparatus of claim 17 wherein said at least one host computer is further operative to compute a correlation between biometric data provided in said service request and biometric data looked up in said host computer. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 6, lines 39-65, col. 15, lines 66-col. 16, line 64, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the appropriate use of biometrics, as broadly interpreted by the examiner, and

would thus clearly encompass 'correlation between biometric data provided in said service request and biometric data looked up in said host system').

12. Claim 8 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The method of claim 1 wherein said step of providing conditional notifications further comprises the step of providing an empty message.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 5, lines 38-col. 6, line 38, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the messaging protocols, as broadly interpreted by the examiner and would clearly encompass 'providing conditional notifications further comprises the step of providing an empty message' insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process, and said messages clearly (i.e., again, in the case of handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) encompass said empty messages.);

Further, as per claim 26 *additionally reciting* the limitation that; "The apparatus of claim 17 wherein said at least one host computer operative to provide notifications is further operative to provide an empty message". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 5, lines 38-col. 6, line 38, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the messaging protocols, as broadly interpreted by the examiner and would clearly encompass 'providing conditional notifications further comprises the step of providing an

Art Unit: 2136

empty message' insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process, and said messages clearly (i.e., again, in the case of handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) encompass said empty messages.).

13. Claim 9 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The method of claim 1 wherein said step of negotiating a machine interpretable service specification between all parties further comprises the step of providing a contract for governing the negotiated service specification.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col. 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'providing a contract for governing the negotiated service specification' as to the setup prior to playing online games insofar as the contract at the very least involves the financial/payment aspects of the player (i.e., his credit card information).);

Further, as per claim 21 *additionally reciting* the limitation that; "The apparatus of claim 17 wherein said at least one host computer is further operative to provide a contract for governing the negotiated service specification.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col. 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of

Art Unit: 2136

'providing a contract for governing the negotiated service specification' as to the setup prior to playing online games insofar as the contract at the very least involves the financial/payment aspects of the player (i.e., his credit card information).).

14. Claim 10 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The method of claim 1 wherein said secure processing steps further comprises the step of notifying said requestor that said service request was processed.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'step of notifying said requestor that said service request was processed' as to the setup prior to playing online games insofar as the contract at the very least involves the financial/payment aspects of the player (i.e., his credit card information), and confirming a credit card is sufficiently funded.);

Further, as per claim 29 *additionally reciting* the limitation that; "The apparatus of claim 17 wherein said at least one host computer operative to provide notifications is further operative to notify said requestor that said service request was processed.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'step of notifying said requestor that said service request was processed' as to the setup prior to playing online games insofar as the contract at the very least involves the

Art Unit: 2136

financial/payment aspects of the player (i.e., his credit card information), and confirming a credit card is sufficiently funded.).

15. Claim 11 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 1 wherein said step of enforcing said service specification further comprises the step of uploading at least one database from at least one party of said cooperating parties, information contained therein from said at least one database is stored in said host system.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches, insofar as the game rule enforcement associated with specific game playing, as broadly interpreted by the examiner would clearly encompass ‘uploading at least one database ... is stored in said host system’ insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process.);

Further, as per claim 27 *additionally reciting* the limitation that; “The apparatus of claim 17 wherein said at least one host computer is further operative to upload at least one database from at least one party of said cooperating parties, information contained therein from said at least one database is adapted to be stored in said host computer.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per

Art Unit: 2136

player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches, insofar as the game rule enforcement associated with specific game playing, as broadly interpreted by the examiner would clearly encompass 'uploading at least one database ... is stored in said host system' insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process.).

16. Claim 12 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The method of claim 4 wherein said step of negotiating multiple machine interpretable service specifications between any cooperating parties further comprises the step of providing a contract for governing each negotiated service specification." The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'providing a contract for governing each negotiated service specification' as to the setup prior to playing online games insofar as the contract at the very least involves the financial/payment aspects of the player (i.e., his credit card information).).

17. Claim 13 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The method of claim 1 wherein said step of providing conditional notifications further comprises the step of providing a notification that is adapted to contain information about said individual." The teachings of Schneier et al are

Art Unit: 2136

directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 5, lines 38-col. 6, line 38, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the messaging protocols, as broadly interpreted by the examiner and would clearly encompass 'providing a notification that is adapted to contain information about said individual' insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process, and said messages clearly (i.e., again, in the case of handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) encompass said affirmative verification of financial/authentication of user/user specified gaming information messages.);

Further, as per claim 30 *additionally reciting* the limitation that; "The apparatus of claim 27 wherein said at least one host computer operative to provide notifications is further operative to provide conditional notifications that is adapted to contain information about an individual.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 5, lines 38-col. 6, line 38, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the messaging protocols, as broadly interpreted by the examiner and would clearly encompass 'providing a notification that is adapted to contain information about said individual' insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process, and said messages

Art Unit: 2136

clearly (i.e., again, in the case of handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) encompass said affirmative verification of financial/authentication of user/user specified gaming information messages.).

18. Claim 14 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 13, wherein said step of providing a notification that is adapted to contain information about said individual further comprises the step of providing said notification to at least one party of said cooperating parties, said at least one party of said cooperating parties is a party other than said requestor.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 5, lines 38-col. 6, line 38, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the messaging protocols, as broadly interpreted by the examiner and would clearly encompass ‘providing said notification ... other than said requestor’ insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process, and said messages clearly (i.e., again, in the case of handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) encompass said affirmative verification of financial/authentication of user/user specified gaming information messages, and further, the multiple players client network nodes clearly communicate interactively during game setup and actual game playing.);

Further, as per claim 31 *additionally reciting* the limitation that; “The apparatus of claim 18 wherein said at least one host computer is further operative to provide said conditional

Art Unit: 2136

notifications to another party of said cooperating parties, said another party of said cooperating parties is a party other than said requestor.” The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 5, lines 38-col. 6, line 38, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the messaging protocols, as broadly interpreted by the examiner and would clearly encompass ‘providing said notification ... other than said requestor’ insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process, and said messages clearly (i.e., again, in the case of handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) encompass said affirmative verification of financial/authentication of user/user specified gaming information messages, and further, the multiple players client network nodes clearly communicate interactively during game setup and actual game playing.).

19. Claim 15 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 14, wherein said step of providing a notification to at least one party of said cooperating parties that is adapted to contain information about said individual further comprises the step of providing notification to said at least one party of said cooperating parties that is a party other than a provider of said stored data.” The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 5, lines 38-col. 6, line 38, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the messaging protocols, as broadly interpreted by the examiner and would clearly encompass

Art Unit: 2136

'providing notification ... other than a provider of said stored data' insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process, and said messages clearly (i.e., again, in the case of handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) encompass said affirmative verification of financial/authentication of user/user specified gaming information messages, and further, the multiple players client network nodes clearly communicate interactively during game setup and actual game playing.);

Further, as per claim 32 *additionally reciting* the limitation that; "The method of claim 31, wherein said at least one host computer operative to provide said conditional notifications to said another party of said cooperating parties is further operative to provide said conditional notifications to a party other than a provider of said stored data.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 5, lines 38-col. 6, line 38, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the messaging protocols, as broadly interpreted by the examiner and would clearly encompass 'providing notification ... other than a provider of said stored data' insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process, and said messages clearly (i.e., again, in the case of handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) encompass said affirmative verification of financial/authentication of user/user specified gaming information messages, and further, the

Art Unit: 2136

multiple players client network nodes clearly communicate interactively during game setup and actual game playing.).

20. Claim 16 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 1 wherein said step of providing conditional notifications further comprises the step of providing a notification to at least one party of said cooperating parties that is adapted to contain no information about said individual.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 5, lines 38-col. 6, line 38, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the messaging protocols, as broadly interpreted by the examiner and would clearly encompass ‘providing a notification ... to contain no information about said individual’ insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process, and said messages clearly (i.e., again, in the case of handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) encompass said affirmative verification of financial/authentication of user/user specified gaming information messages that in acting as a simple verification/authentication of user without explicit user identification (i.e., acknowledgement of message via IP address and not user of network node at said IP address).).

21. Claim 18 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The apparatus of claim 17, wherein said at least one host computer is further operative to define said service specification to: identify

Art Unit: 2136

said cooperating parties (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'identify cooperating parties'); identify said requestor and the format of said service request, said request is adapted to contain information about an individual (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'requestor and format of a service request' insofar as the communications protocols of the game initiator at least is concerned (i.e., figure 4 and associated description).); conduct conditional processing steps required for said service request, said conditional processing steps is adapted to use stored data about said individual (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'conditional processing steps is adapted to use stored data about said individual'.); and provide conditional notifications, said conditional notifications is adapted to include additional information about the individual described in the request (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'additional information about the individual described in the request' insofar as the requestor clearly must have submitted user information in the game registration process as any of the other player are similarly required to do so.).". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28).

Art Unit: 2136

22. Claim 19 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The apparatus of claim 17 wherein said at least one host computer is further operative to execute said secure processing to: determine the service specification that governs said service request; validate said requestor and the content of the service request against an expected requestor and expected contents as defined in the service specification; and execute conditional processing as defined in the service specification.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the cryptographic processors, on a per player user client terminal and server side host, clearly teaches of ‘secure computation environment ...’ insofar as the authentication and actual game playing cryptographic functions serviced via the cryptographic processor secure computing environment.).

23. Claim 20 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The apparatus of claim 17 wherein said at least one host computer is further operative to provide said notifications as conditional notifications that is adapted to include additional information about an individual described in the request.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of ‘additional information about the individual described in the request’ insofar as the requestor clearly must have submitted user information in the game registration process as any of the other player are similarly required to do so.).

24. As per claim 33; "An identification apparatus for matching individuals, the apparatus comprising: at least one host computer adapted to have at least one secure co-processor operating in a secure computation environment, said at least one host computer operative to: negotiate a machine interpretable contract between all parties, which would cooperate with a particular application running on said host computer; upload said contract into said secure computation environment; enforce said contract with regards to all cooperating parties; receive a service request from a requestor, execute secure processing of said service request; and provide notifications as defined in the contract [This claim is the system as applied to the identification aspects of the claim for the method claims 1 and 9 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 1 and 9 rejections].";

Further, as per claim 37; "An identification method [This claim is the method claim for the system claim 33 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 33 rejection] for matching individuals, the method comprising the steps of: providing at least one host computer adapted to have at least one secure co-processor operating in a secure computation environment; operating said at least one host computer to negotiate a machine interpretable contract between all parties, which would cooperate with a particular application running on said host computer; uploading said contract into said secure computation environment; enforcing said contract with regards to all cooperating parties; receiving a service request from a requestor; executing secure processing of said service request; and providing notifications as defined in the contract.";

Further, as per claim 39; "A program storage device readable by a machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform methods steps [This

Art Unit: 2136

claim is the embodied software claim for the method claim 37 above, whereas this claim involves 'negotiate ... service specification between all parties' versus the claim 37 'negotiate ... contract between all parties'. The phrases 'negotiate ... contract between all parties', and 'negotiate ... service specification between all parties' as broadly interpreted by the examiner, are equivalent insofar as the negotiation of the service specification is an instance of the contract (i.e., the contract is the 'framework or protocol' upon which the service specification is based, and the protocol of user initiation/player parameters as entered and stored in the server/clients clearly establishes equivalency, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 37 rejection] for managing a matching identification service, the method comprising the steps of: providing at least one host computer adapted to have at least one secure co-processor operating in a secure computation environment; operating said at least one host computer to negotiate a machine interpretable service specification between all parties, which would cooperate with a particular application running on said host computer; uploading said service specification into said secure computation environment; enforcing said service specification with regards to all cooperating parties; receiving a service request from a requestor; executing secure processing of said service request; and providing notifications as defined in the service specification.";

Further, as per claim 40; "An article of manufacture [This claim is the embodied software claim for the method claim 37 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 37 rejection] for use in matching individuals, comprising a machine readable medium tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by a machine for implementing a method, the method comprising steps of: providing at least one host computer adapted to have at least one secure co-processor operating in a secure computation environment; operating said at least one

Art Unit: 2136

host computer to negotiate a machine interpretable contract between all parties, which would cooperate with a particular application running on said host computer; uploading said contract into said secure computation environment; enforcing said contract with regards to all cooperating parties; receiving a service request from a requestor; executing secure processing of said service request; and providing notifications as defined in the contract.”;

Further, as per claim 41; “A program storage device readable by a machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform methods steps [This claim is the embodied software claim for the method claim 37 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 37 rejection] for managing a matching identification service, the method comprising the steps of: providing at least one host computer adapted to have at least one secure co-processor operating in a secure computation environment; operating said at least one host computer to negotiate a machine interpretable contract between all parties, which would cooperate with a particular application running on said host computer; uploading said contract into said secure computation environment; enforcing said contract with regards to all cooperating parties; receiving a service request from a requestor; executing secure processing of said service request; and providing notifications as defined in the contract.”;

Further, as per claim 42; “A computer-based method [This claim is the more specific version of claim 37 above, such that the server/client and ‘other node’ is involved. The electronic gaming network consisting of a server (i.e., game server service provider application common to all players), and clients (i.e., the terminal players) interactively linked by the inherent nature of said network games, as broadly interpreted by the examiner, are equivalent insofar as the clients clearly being interactive pass information between themselves. Therefore, claim 42 is rejected

for the same reasons provided for the claim 37 rejection.] for a multiparty electronic service, the method comprising steps of: implementing on a computer system at least one contract for governing a service between a service provider, a client and at least one other party; receiving at said service provider a first request from a client; sending from said service provider a data request to one of at least one other party; receiving, at said service provider from said one of at least one other party, a data response in a secure computation environment; determining, in accordance with said contract, whether a match exists between said first request and said data response; if a match results from said determining step, providing a notification of said match to said at least one other party.”;

25. Claim 43 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 42 further comprises the step of providing said notification even if there is no match as determined in said determining step.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 5, lines 38-col. 6, line 38, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the messaging protocols, as broadly interpreted by the examiner and would clearly encompass ‘providing said notification ... no match ... determining step’ insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process, and said messages clearly (i.e., again, in the case of handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) encompass said affirmative verification of financial/authentication of user/user specified gaming information

Art Unit: 2136

messages that in acting as a simple verification/authentication of user without explicit user identification (i.e., acknowledgement of message via IP address and not user of network node at said IP address).).

26. Claim 44 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 43, wherein said step of providing said notification comprises the step of providing a dummy message to said at least one other party.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 5, lines 38-col. 6, line 38, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly; clearly teaches of the messaging protocols, as broadly interpreted by the examiner and would clearly encompass ‘providing said notification comprises the step of providing a dummy message’ insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process, and said messages clearly (i.e., again, in the case of handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) encompass said empty messages.).

27. Claim 45 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 42 further comprises the step of notifying said client that said first request was processed.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col

Art Unit: 2136

17,line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'step of notifying said requestor that said service request was processed' as to the setup prior to playing online games insofar as the contract at the very least involves the financial/payment aspects of the player (i.e., his credit card information), and confirming a credit card is sufficiently funded.).

28. Claim 46 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The method of claim 42 wherein the implementing the at least one contract step comprises the step of assigning a contract ID for any contract that governs a service between the service provider, the client and the at least one other party.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17,line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12,lines 35-col 17,line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of ' ... step of assigning a contract ID for any contract ... between the service provider, the client and the at least one other party' as to the setup prior to playing online games insofar as the contract at the very least involves the financial/payment aspects of the player (i.e., his credit card information), which has a 'specific game played here and now' identification aspect (i.e., the IP address of the clients using said contract at the any given game).).

29. Claim 47 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The method of claim 42 further comprises the step of executing the previous steps in a contract engine within the secure computation environment.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17,line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players

Art Unit: 2136

selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of '... step of executing the previous steps in a contract engine within' insofar as the gaming system architecture is clearly modular (i.e., client/server based at the hardware and software levels of abstraction), of which the "engine" modularity data structure, as broadly interpreted by the examiner, is so encompassed.).

30. Claim 48 ***additionally recites*** the limitation that; "The method of claim 47 further comprises the step of providing a plurality of contract engines coupled to a communication network.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of '... providing a plurality of contract engines coupled to a communication network' insofar as the contract is clearly executed on the individual client terminals, as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

31. Claim 49 ***additionally recites*** the limitation that; "The method of claim 42 wherein the determining step comprises the step of performing the determination in a crypto-coprocessor.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the cryptographic processors, on a per player user client terminal and server side host, clearly teaches of 'determination in a crypto-coprocessor' insofar as the authentication

Art Unit: 2136

and actual game playing cryptographic functions serviced via the cryptographic processor secure computing environment.).

32. As per claim 50; "A computer-based method [This claim is the more general version of claim 37 above, such that the server/client and 'other node' is involved. The electronic gaming network consisting of a server (i.e., game server service provider application common to all players), and clients (i.e., the terminal players) interactively linked by the inherent nature of said network games, as broadly interpreted by the examiner, are equivalent insofar as the clients clearly being interactive pass information between themselves. Therefore, claim 42 is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 37 rejection.] for a multiparty electronic service, the method comprising steps of: implementing on a computer system at least one contract for governing a service between a service provider, a client and at least one other party; determining, in accordance with said contract, whether a match exists between a first request from said client and a data response from one of at least one other party; if a match results from said determining step, providing a notification of said match to said at least one other party.";

Further, as per claim 59; "Apparatus [This claim is the system claim for the method claim 50 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 50 rejection] for a multiparty electronic service, the apparatus comprising: at least one host computer operative to: maintain and enforce at least one contract for governing a service between a service provider, a client and at least one other party; and to determine, in accordance with said at least one contract, whether a match exists between a first request from said client and a data response from one of at

Art Unit: 2136

least one other party; said at least one host computer is further operative to provide a notification to said at least one other party if a match results from said determination.”

33. Claim 51 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 50 further comprises the step of providing said notification even if there is no match as determined in said determining step.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 5, lines 38-col. 6, line 38, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the messaging protocols, as broadly interpreted by the examiner and would clearly encompass ‘providing said notification ... no match ... determining step’ insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process, and said messages clearly (i.e., again, in the case of handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) encompass said affirmative verification of financial/authentication of user/user specified gaming information messages that in acting as a simple verification/authentication of user without explicit user identification (i.e., acknowledgement of message via IP address and not user of network node at said IP address).);

Further, as per claim 60 *additionally reciting* the limitation that; “The apparatus [This claim is the system claim for the method claim 51 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 51 rejection] of claim 59, wherein said at least one host computer is

Art Unit: 2136

further operative to provide said notification to said at least one other party if no match results from said determination.”.

34. Claim 52 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 51, wherein said step of providing said notification comprises the step of providing a dummy message to said at least one other party.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 5, lines 38-col. 6, line 38, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the messaging protocols, as broadly interpreted by the examiner and would clearly encompass ‘providing said notification comprises the step of providing a dummy message’ insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process, and said messages clearly (i.e., again, in the case of handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) encompass said empty messages.);

Further, as per claim 61 *additionally reciting* the limitation that; “The apparatus [This claim is the system claim for the method claim 52 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 52 rejection] of claim 60, wherein said at least one host computer is further operative to provide a dummy message to said at least one other party.”.

35. Claim 53 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 50 further comprises the step of notifying said client that said first request was processed.”. The teachings

Art Unit: 2136

of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'step of notifying said requestor that said service request was processed' as to the setup prior to playing online games insofar as the contract at the very least involves the financial/payment aspects of the player (i.e., his credit card information), and confirming a credit card is sufficiently funded.);

Further, as per claim 62 *additionally reciting* the limitation that, "The apparatus [This claim is the system claim for the method claim 53 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 53 rejection] of claim 59, wherein said at least one host computer is further operative to provide a notification to said client that said first request was processed."

36. Claim 63 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The apparatus [This claim is the system claim for the database and communications aspects of method claim 11 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 11 rejection] of claim 59, wherein said at least one host computer comprises: a secure computation environment for processing sensitive data; a network handler for sending and receiving messages to and from said secure computation environment and a network; and a storage handler to process database requests that come from inside said secure computation environment and retrieves information from a secured database containing said contracts and private information data."

Art Unit: 2136

37. Claim 54 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 50 wherein the implementing the at least one contract step comprises the step of assigning a contract ID for any contract that governs a service between the service provider, the client and the at least one other party.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of ‘... step of assigning a contract ID for any contract ... between the service provider, the client and the at least one other party’ as to the setup prior to playing online games insofar as the contract at the very least involves the financial/payment aspects of the player (i.e., his credit card information), which has a ‘specific game played here and now’ identification aspect (i.e., the IP address of the clients using said contract at the any given game).);

Further, as per claim 64 *additionally reciting* the limitation that; “The apparatus [This claim is the system claim for the method claim 54 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 54 rejection] of claim 59, wherein said at least one host computer is further operative to provide a contract ID for any contract that governs a service between the service provider, the client and the at least one other party.”.

38. As per claim 55; “A computer-based method [This claim is the combination of claims 50 and 54, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 50,54 rejections.] for managing a matching identification service, the method comprising the steps of: implementing on a computer system at least one contract having a contract ID for governing said matching

Art Unit: 2136

identification service between a service provider, a client and at least one other party determining, in accordance with said contract ID, whether a match exists between a first request from said client and a data response from one of at least one other party; if a match results from said determining step, providing a notification of said match to said at least one other party.”;

Further, as per claim 65; “Apparatus [This claim is the system claim for the method claim 55 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 55 rejection] for a matching identification service, the apparatus comprising: at least one host computer operative to: maintain and enforce at least one contract having a contract ID for governing a service between a service provider, a client and at least one other party; and to determine, in accordance with said at least one contract, whether a match exists between a first request from said client and a data response from one of at least one other party; said at least one host computer is further operative to provide a notification to said at least one other party if a match results from said determination.”.

39. Claim 66 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The apparatus [This claim is the system claim for the database and communications aspects of method claim 11 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 11 rejection] of claim 65, wherein said at least one host computer comprises: a secure computation environment for processing sensitive data; a network handler for sending and receiving messages to and from said secure computation environment and a network; and a storage handler to process database requests that come from inside said secure computation environment and retrieves information from a secured database containing said contracts and private information data.”.

Art Unit: 2136

40. Claim 67 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The apparatus of claim 66, wherein said secure computation environment comprises a contract engine operative to: handle said first request, conduct a matching task, and provide a respond serving as said notification.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of ‘ ... computation environment comprises a contract engine operative to: handle ... ’ insofar as the gaming system architecture is clearly modular (i.e., client/server based at the hardware and software levels of abstraction), of which the “engine” modularity data structure, as broadly interpreted by the examiner, is so encompassed, and clearly as described above, comprises a crypto-processor, etc., (i.e., the secure computing environment)).

41. Claim 68 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The apparatus of claim 65, wherein said at least one host computer is further operative to provide said notification to said at least one other party if no match results from said determination”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 5, lines 38-col. 6, line 38, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the messaging protocols, as broadly interpreted by the examiner and would clearly encompass ‘providing said notification ... no match ... determining step’ insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication

results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process, and said messages clearly (i.e., again, in the case of handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) encompass said affirmative verification of financial/authentication of user/user specified gaming information messages that in acting as a simple verification/authentication of user without explicit user identification (i.e., acknowledgement of message via IP address and not user of network node at said IP address)).

42. Claim 56 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 55 further comprises the step of providing said notification even if there is no match as determined in said determining step.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 5, lines 38-col. 6, line 38, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the messaging protocols, as broadly interpreted by the examiner and would clearly encompass ‘providing said notification ... no match ... determining step’ insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process, and said messages clearly (i.e., again, in the case of handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) encompass said affirmative verification of financial/authentication of user/user specified gaming information messages that in acting as a simple verification/authentication of user without explicit user identification (i.e., acknowledgement of message via IP address and not user of network node at said IP address)).

43. Claim 57 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The method of claim 56, wherein said step of providing said notification comprises the step of providing a dummy message to said at least one other party." The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 5, lines 38-col. 6, line 38, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the messaging protocols, as broadly interpreted by the examiner and would clearly encompass 'providing said notification comprises the step of providing a dummy message' insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process, and said messages clearly (i.e., again, in the case of handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) encompass said empty messages.).

44. Claim 58 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The method of claim 56 further comprises the step of notifying said client that said first request was processed." The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'step of notifying said requestor that said service request was processed' as to the setup prior to playing online games insofar as the contract at the

very least involves the financial/payment aspects of the player (i.e., his credit card information), and confirming a credit card is sufficiently funded.).

45. As per claim 36; "A multiparty electronic service method [i.e., Abstract, whereas the playing of electronic games over a network by one or more players corresponds to the 'multiparty electronic service'] comprising the steps of: providing at least one host computer adapted to have at least one secure co-processor operating in a secure computation environment [i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the cryptographic processors, on a per player user client terminal and server side host, clearly teaches of 'secure computation environment'.]; operating said at least one host computer to negotiate a machine interpretable service specification between all parties, which would cooperate with a particular application running on said host computer [i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'service specification between all parties' as to the setup prior to playing online games/establishing associated random number information associated with said playing of games.]; uploading said service specification into said secure computation environment [i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'uploading said service specification' insofar as the clients and servers clearly have the same rules and all associated information required to play.]; enforcing said service specification with regards to all cooperating parties [i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas

Art Unit: 2136

the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'enforcing said service specification with regards to all cooperating parties' insofar as the clients and servers clearly have the same rules and all associated information required to play, and as such use said information during the actual game playing.]; receiving a service request from a requestor [i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the subsequent to the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'receiving a service request from said requestor' insofar as the clients and servers clearly have the same rules and all associated information required to play, and as such use said information during the actual game playing.]; executing secure processing of said service request [i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the cryptographic processors, on a per player user client terminal and server side host, clearly teaches of 'secure computation environment' insofar as the authentication and actual game playing cryptographic functions serviced via the cryptographic processor secure computing environment.]; and providing notifications as defined in the service specification [i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'additional information about the individual described in the request' insofar as the requestor clearly must have submitted user information in the game registration process as any of the other player are similarly required to do so.]”;

Further, as per claim 38; “An article of manufacture [This claim is the embodied software claim for the method claim 36 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim

Art Unit: 2136

36 rejection] for use in a multiparty electronic service, comprising a machine readable medium tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by a machine for implementing a method, the method comprising steps of: providing at least one host computer adapted to have at least one secure co-processor operating in a secure computation environment; operating said at least one host computer to negotiate a machine interpretable service specification between all parties, which would cooperate with a particular application running on said host computer; uploading said service specification into said secure computation environment; enforcing said service specification with regards to all cooperating parties; receiving a service request from a requestor; executing secure processing of said service request; and providing notifications as defined in the service specification.”.

Conclusion

46. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from examiner should be directed to Ronald Baum, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3681, and whose unofficial Fax number is (571) 273-3681. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh, can be reached at (571) 272-3795. The Fax number for the organization where this application is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Ronald Baum

Patent Examiner



A02131

12/1/04

Application/Control Number: 10/065,802

Art Unit: 2136

Page 45